

**REMARKS**

Claims 25 - 29 are in the case, with Claim 25 being the sole independent claim.

A typographical error in clause a) of Claim 25 has been corrected.


As Applicant understands the Office Action of 05 August 2008, the Examiner appears to hold that Applicant's argument set out at page 4, line 23 through page 5, line 8 of Applicant's response dated 15 January 2008 is a valid distinction of Applicant's invention over the art of record, but that Claim 25 was not limited to the specific structural advantage of Applicant's device. Consequently, Applicant has now amended clause f) of Claim 25 to support Applicant's argument.

As to Claim 26, the Examiner appears to agree that the disclosure of Smith is from a totally different art and is therefore not properly combinable with the other two references in a 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection.

In all other respects, Applicant reiterates the discussion of the claims in the response of 15 January 2008.

Inasmuch as Applicant's device is able to achieve a claimed beneficial result that Kelly, lacking a separable liner portion outside his portion 58, cannot achieve, Applicant respectfully submits that an allowance of Claim 25 (and by dependency, Claims 26 - 29) is now in order.

Respectfully submitted,



Harry G. Weissenberger  
Reg. No. 18,784